



06-20-05

3625cc
JGD/BS

PATENT APPLICATION
PRO SE APPLICANT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of:	James L. Driessen)
) Cover Letter
)
Serial No.:	09/630,272) Art Unit
) 3625
Confirmation No.:	7426)
)
Filed:	Date August 1, 2000)
)
Examiner:	Nicholas D. Rosen)

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria VA 22313-1450

Commissioner:

Please accept the following response to Office Action mailed to Applicant on 03/31/2005. Included in the response are amendments, arguments, and affidavit evidence to support allowance of the claims. I apologize for the the length of the response, but Class 705 computer related business methods patent applications are by nature a high level degree of complexity and therefore a response also requires the detailed level of scrutiny provided here.

This mailing is being deposited via U.S.P.S. Express Mail services with receipt number ER981108999 US containing: this cover letter; Form PTO-2038 credit card payment; Amendment with arguments on pages number 2-84; and 8 pages of supporting documents including affidavit evidence. Herein Applicant request your consideration of arguments, amendments, and other considerations which should place all claims in a condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

James L. Driessen, Applicant Pro Se



Appl. No. : 09/630,272

Confirmation No. : 7426

Applicant : James L. Driessen

Filed : August 1, 2000

TC/A.U. : 3625

Examiner : Nicholas D. Rosen

Pro Se Applicant

Commissioner for Patents

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria VA 22313-1450

AMENDMENT

Sir: In response to the Office action of March 31, 2005, please amend the above-identified application as follows:

Amendments to the Specification are required. Replacement paragraphs are submitted which begins on page 4 of this paper.

Amendments to the Claims are reflected in the listing of claims beginning on a separate page, which is page 6 of this paper.

Amendments to the Drawings are not required at this time and no drawing figures are submitted with this paper.

Remarks/Arguments, which also include affidavits, begin on page 15 of this paper.

Additional Statement about Manner of Amendments: It is not absolutely necessary, but perhaps important for the "second pair of eyes" in this prosecution to understand the prosecution history as well as the history of the applicant during these proceedings. Applicant/Inventor

06/21/2005 WARDELLI 000000081 09630272
01 FC:2201
02 FC:2202
100.00 OP
50.00 OP

wrote the application and began prosecution *Pro Se* with little knowledge of the law and procedures required by the USPTO, but knowledge has certainly been developed in and during this process. Applicant had begun law school full-time during those 5 years of prosecution and is now practicing as an attorney licensed in Utah; but Applicant is not licensed to practice before the USPTO and therefore, still continues this prosecution *Pro Se*.

The original application contained informalities as noted by the Office of Initial Patent Examination (OIPE). For purposes of this amendment:

1. The replacement specification on December 12, 2003 at the OIPE, JC 187 should be considered the most recent version of the specification prior to this point.
2. Applicant supplied line numbers contained in the December 12, 2003 replacement specification will be used to "unambiguously identify the location to ... replace a paragraph with one or more replacement paragraphs" for purposes of amending the specification with this mailing (see 09/630,272 IFW, see also 37 C.F.R. 1.121 (b) (1)(i)).
3. Formal errors in claim construction in both the original application and in subsequent amendments eventually prompted Examiner's amendments leading to verbal allowance of claims 14-27, but those amendments and allowance have *not* become a part of the official file wrapper (see 09/630,272 IFW).

NOTE: The Examiner first cited the Powers reference in an office action, but further discussion of any issues, remarks, or comments herein, which may explore the Powers reference further or attempt to explain it, may contain additional information that could be "material to patentability." But, "the duty to disclose all information known to be material to patentability is deemed to be satisfied if all information known to be material to patentability of any claim issued in a patent

was cited by the Office or submitted to the Office." See 37 C.F.R. 1.56. Therefore, this small bit of further external research made by applicant into the Powers reference particularly will be encapsulated in these arguments which should satisfy Applicants requirement for continued disclosure without the need for a separate filing of a separate Information Disclosure Sheet (IDS). Should the Office require such an IDS in this instance, Applicant will comply, but an IDS at this point would be at considerable expense to Applicant.